

ECFS - E-mail Filing  
<PROCEEDING>RM-10867  
<DATE>03/28/2004  
<NAME>Edward A. Cienki  
<ADDRESS1>5 Golf Drive  
<ADDRESS2>  
<CITY>Hammonton  
<STATE>NJ  
<ZIP>08037  
<LAW-FIRM>  
<ATTORNEY>  
<FILE-NUMBER>  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE>CO  
<PHONE-NUMBER>  
<DESCRIPTION>Email Comment  
<CONTACT-EMAIL>ecienki@bellatlantic.net  
<TEXT>Dear FCC:

I am a licensed amateur radio operator and an attorney. I have reviewed the petitions of three parties. First is the one submitted by the Amateur Radio Relay League (ARRL) under RM-10867. This proposal provides a compromise between the other two substantial submissions, one made by the "unincorporated" entity calling themselves the Radio Amateur Foundation (RAF) under RM-10868 and the other made by the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) under RM-10870 and previously under RM-10787. I respectfully submit that all three parties do have their pecuniary interests at heart, however, the one submitted by the ARRL provides the greatest level of balance and compromise to meet the needs of the hobby as a whole and the ARRL does speak for many of the amateur radio operators licensed.

First, it is recognized that pursuant to the World Radiocommunication Conference 2003 actions last summer that made changes to Article 25 of the international Radio Regulations recognize that morse code is a no longer needed. In reality, morse code is just another "mode" of communication. This is no different than using rtty, fec, or any other mode, which does not require special licensing. Morse code should not be the threshold that determines whether or not an operator can be licensed on the high frequency (HF) bands. Morse Code's use is not limited to HF bands. Rather, it is also actively used on the VHF and UHF bands also. So, licensure should be based upon the ability of an operator to adhere to "good engineering practices" and morse code should be eliminated as it does nothing to further that objective. Therefore, I support the elimination of the morse code requirement for the proposed entry level Novice class and the proposed restructured (technician and technician plus categories into the) General class license.

Second, I support the ARRL's petition that Morse Code be retained for the Amateur Extra Class License. This does preserve those trying to (a) maintain incentive licensing for the hobby, and (b) preserve the spectrum for those operators desiring to use morse code.

Third, I support collapsing the operating classes into three groups as proposed. The entry level Novice Class, the newly merged General Class and the merged Extra Class. This will decrease administrative burden

upon the FCC and can be implemented with relative ease. Unfortunately, this is not the case with the NCVEC proposal.

In summary, while my comments may come under criticism by others because of my current license status as an amateur radio operator, I submit that the RAF's proposal does nothing for the public good. Rather, it is intended to retard the purposes of the hobby and licensing of amateur radio operators. Additionally, and while I respect the intentions of the NCVEC, I believe that bridge can be crossed at a later date. This is why I support the petition submitted by the ARRL under RM-10867.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Edward A. Cienki, Esq.  
n2eac